

LIEUT. GEORGE D. HILL.

JANUARY 19, 1877.—Laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHN REILLY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted the following

REPORT:

[To accompany H. Res. 17.]

*The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution above named, having examined the same, would report thereon as follows :*

From the records of the War Department, reported by the Adjutant-General of the Army, the following appear to be the facts in the case:

“George D. Hill was mustered in as second lieutenant First Michigan Cavalry January 2, 1865, promoted first lieutenant May 1, 1865, and mustered out November 7, 1865. He was appointed first lieutenant Forty-second United States Infantry, (Veteran Reserve Corps,) July 28, 1866; became unassigned or supernumerary April 22, 1869, (on consolidation of Army,) and was placed on the retired list December 31, 1870, with the increased rank and pay of captain of cavalry, on account of wound received April 9, 1865, (resulting in amputation of left arm,) when second lieutenant First Michigan Cavalry, and prior to appointment in the Regular Army. He was retired with the increased rank under section 32 of the act of July 28, 1866, having been in command of two companies of his regiment when wounded.”

It seems from the records that Captain Hill was on duty as Indian agent in Wyoming Territory at the date of his retirement, (December 31, 1870,) but was not relieved of the duties and property in his charge by the agent the Indian Bureau sent to succeed him until on or about April 1, 1871; hence the claim to correct the records, on the ground that he was in the service until that date. Even on this ground your committee do not think it sufficient, the office of Indian agent being a civil rather than a military one. Further, if Captain Hill had been retained on the rolls after the 1st day of January, 1871, he would, as a supernumerary officer, be “mustered out with one year’s pay and allowances.” (Act July 15, 1870, section 12.) Should Congress correct his record, as asked for in the bill, it would have the effect of continuing him in the service after the 1st day of January, 1871, contrary to the express provisions of the law cited, and also allow him to complete a period of five years’ service, and thus become entitled to 10 per cent. increase of his retired pay.

Your committee are of the opinion that neither the law nor the facts in the case would justify the passage of the bill; and they therefore recommend that it do not pass, and that it lie upon the table.